arXiv:cond-mat/9503035v1 7 Mar 1995

Delocalization of electrons in a Random Magnetic Field

D.N. Sheng and Z. Y. Weng

Texas Center for Superconductivity and Department of Physics

University of Houston, Houston, TX 77204-5506

Abstract

Delocalization problem for a two-dimensional non-interacting electron system is studied under a random magnetic field. With the presence of a random magnetic field, the Hall conductance carried by each eigenstate can become nonzero and quantized in units of e^2/h. Extended states are characterized by nonzero Hall conductance, and by studying finite-size scaling of the density of extended states, an insulator-metal phase transition is revealed. The metallic phase is found at the center of energy band which is separated from the localized states at the band tails by critical energies $\pm E_c$. Both localization exponent and the critical energy E_c are shown to be dependent on the strength of random magnetic field.

PACS numbers: 71.30.+h, 71.55.Jv, 71.50+t

The Anderson localization theory[1,2] predicts that all states in a two-dimensional (2D) electron system are localized in the absence of a magnetic field. The quantum Hall effect (QHE) system is a first example of 2D systems which show the existence of truly extended states.[3,4] In this latter case, the presence of a magnetic field breaks the time-reversal symmetry and destroys constructive interference of the backward scattering[2] so that it is possible for electrons to propagate forwardly.

Recently, an intensive attention has been attracted to the delocalization problem in a 2D random-magnetic-field system. This problem is closely related to the half-filled QHE system[5,6] as well as the gauge-field description[7,8] of the high-T_c superconductivity problem. However, despite a lot of numerical and theoretical efforts, the issue of delocalization still remains controversial. Theoretically, Zhang and Arovas[9] have recently argued that the field-theory description, which corresponds to a non-linear sigma-model of the unitary class without a topological term due to zero average of magnetic field, should have a term representing a long-range logarithmic interaction of the topological density (due to the local magnetic field). This singular term may lead to a phase transition from localized state to extended one. But it is contradictory to the conclusion that all the states are localized obtained by Aronov, Mirlin and Wolfle[10] in a similar approach. Earlier numerical works[11–13] also have given conflicting results. Recently, with a larger sample size, Liu *et al.*[14] have found a scaling behavior of the localization length near the energy band tail, which can be extrapolated to give a insulator-metal transition energy E_c. Nevertheless, a metallic phase has not been directly confirmed since no scaling behavior has been found there. In the possible metallic region, an even larger sample size may be needed in order to distinguish whether the states are really extended or very weakly localized[11] with the localization length much longer than the sample size.

Thus it would be desirable to study this delocalization problem from an alternative numerical method which directly probes topological properties of system with less finite-size effect. Thouless and co-workers[15] and others [16,17] have found that delocalization property of a wavefunction in the presence of magnetic field can be well characterized by its associ-

ated quantized Hall conductance. Nodes of an eigenstate wavefunction with nonzero Hall conductance can move freely and cover the whole real space when one continuously change the boundary condition.[17] Such a covering of real space by the nodes has been related to a topological invariant integer (known as First Chern number), which is identical to the quantized number of the Hall conductance (in unit of e^2/h). Thus a nonzero Hall conductance describes the extensiveness of a wavefunction. In contrast, a zero-Hall conductance state will always be localized in 2D with the presence of weak-impurities (Anderson localization). In the QHE system, Huo and Bhatt[18] have calculated the boundary-phase-averaged Hall conductance for each eigenstate of a noninteracting electron system in the presence of strong magnetic field, and extrapolated the density of extended states (with nonzero Hall conductance) to the thermodynamic limit (sample size varying from 8 to 128). They have found that all extended states collapse to a single energy E_c at the center of the Landau band, with a localization length $\xi \propto 1/|E - E_c|^\nu$ and localization exponent $\nu = 2.4$ in agreement with previous known results.

In the present random magnetic field case, the total Hall conductance on average has to be zero. But one still finds nonzero quantized Hall-conductances for eigenstates at each random flux configuration. Due to the general relation between a nonzero Hall conductance and delocalization of the corresponding wavefunction,[15] one can use this topological quantity to characterize delocalized states. Similar point of view also lies in the heart of the field-theory approach of Zhang and Arovas.[9] In this Letter, we shall use this topological property in our numerical approach. By studying the sample-size dependence of the density of extended states which are states with nonzero Hall conductance, an insulator-metal phase transition will be revealed. The extended states are found near the center of energy band, and the states at the band tail are all localized with both localization exponent and transition energy $\pm E_c$ depending on the random magnetic field strength.

We consider a tight-binding lattice model of noninteracting electrons under a random

magnetic field. The Hamiltonian is defined as follows:

$$H = -\sum_{<ij>} e^{ia_{ij}} c_i^+ c_j + \sum_i w_i c_i^+ c_i \tag{1}$$

Here c_i^+ is a fermionic creation operator, with $< ij >$ referring to two nearest neighboring sites. A magnetic flux per plaquette is given as $\phi = \sum_\Box a_{ij}$, where the summation runs over four links around a plaquette. We study the case in which ϕ for each plaqutte is randomly distributed between $-h_0\pi$ and $h_0\pi$, and w_i is also a random potential with strength $|w_i| \leq w$. For simplicity, we assume no correlations among different plaquettes for ϕ and different sites for w_i (white noise limit). The total flux for each random configuration is always chosen to be zero. The finite system is diagonalized under the generalized boundary condition $|\Psi(i+L_j) >= e^{i\theta_j}|\Psi(i) >$ (j=1,2 represent x and y direction respectively) with lattice width $L_1 = L_2 = L$, and a total number of lattice sites (sample size) is $\mathcal{N} = L \times L$ (the lattice constant is chosen to be the unit).

The Hall conductance can be calculated by using the Kubo formula. One may relate a Hall conductance to each eigenstate $|m >$:

$$\sigma_{xy}^{(m)} = \frac{ie^2h}{2\pi} \sum_{n \neq m} \frac{< m|p_x|n >< n|p_y|m > - < m|p_y|n >< n|p_x|m >}{(\varepsilon_m - \varepsilon_n)^2} \tag{2}$$

where $\mathbf{p}$ is the velocity operator defined as $p_\tau = i\sum_i (c_{i+\tau}^+ c_i e^{ia_{i+\tau,i}} - c_i^+ c_{i+\tau} e^{-ia_{i+\tau,i}})$ with $\tau = \hat{x}$ or $\hat{y}$. The total Hall conductance for the system is given by $\sigma_H = \sum_{\varepsilon_m < \varepsilon_F} \sigma_{xy}^{(m)}$ at zero temperature, with ε_F as the Fermi energy. σ_H will always be zero on average in the case of a random magnetic field. However, $\sigma_{xy}^{(m)}$ can be nonzero for each random-flux configuration because of the breaking of time-reversal symmetry. As pointed out before, a state with nonzero (quantized) Hall conductance represents an extended state in the thermodynamic limit, whereas a zero-Hall conductance state should always be localized in 2D.

Direct calculation of matrix elements in formula (2) is time consuming. We can make a unitary transformation $|\Phi >= e^{-i\theta_1 x/L} e^{-i\theta_2 y/L}|\Psi >$ such that the new state $|\Phi >$ satisfies a periodical boundary condition. The Hamiltonian (1) is transformed in terms of $a_{ii+\tau} \rightarrow a_{ii+\tau} + \theta_\tau/L$ with $\tau = 1(\hat{x})$ or 2 $(\hat{y})$. Then the boundary-phase averaged conductivity can

be related to partial derivatives of the wave function in the following form:[15]

$$\sigma_{xy}^{(m)} = \frac{ie^2}{4\pi h} \oint d\theta_j \sum_i \left(\Phi_m^*(\theta, i) \frac{\partial \Phi_m(\theta, i)}{\partial \theta_j} - \frac{\partial \Phi_m^*(\theta, i)}{\partial \theta_j} \Phi_m(\theta, i) \right) \tag{3}$$

where the closed-path of the integral is along the boundary of a unit cell $0 \leq \theta_1, \theta_2 \leq 2\pi$. $\sigma_{xy}^{(m)}$ in (3) can be shown[15,16] to be quantized in unit of e^2/h. Here Φ is required to be an analytic wave function in 2D θ-space. Starting from the wavefunction $\Phi(0,0)$ defined at one corner of the boundary in θ-space, the phase of the wavefunction Φ can be uniquely determined[15] by a process of parallel translation, first along θ_1 axis and then along θ_2 axis as:

$$\sum_i \Phi^*(\theta_1, 0) \frac{\partial \Phi(\theta_1, 0)}{\partial \theta_1} = 0, \tag{4a}$$

$$\sum_i \Phi^*(\theta_1, \theta_2) \frac{\partial \Phi(\theta_1, \theta_2)}{\partial \theta_2} = 0. \tag{4b}$$

Numerically we have diagonalized the Hamiltonian with boundary angle varying in whole $2\pi \times 2\pi$ phase space for each given random flux and potential configuration. At each step, θ_j may only change by a very small value such that $\partial\Phi/\partial\theta$ can be well approximated by $\Delta\Phi/\Delta\theta$ (Usually $\Delta\theta < 2\pi/100$ which is adjustable in our numerical calculation to give a reliable result). By constructing a wavefunction satisfying conditions (4), the Hall conductance averaged over boundary angle is determined in terms of (3) for each eigenstate. An eigenstate with nonzero Hall conductance is defined as an extended state, and the corresponding density of states $\rho_{ext}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{N})$ is obtained as a function of energy ε and sample size $\mathcal{N}$ which is averaged over random flux-potential configurations ($200 - 2000$ random configurations depending on sample size).

The total density of states $\rho(\varepsilon, \mathcal{N})$ and the extended one $\rho_{ext}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{N})$ are obtained as a function of energy ε and lattice size $\mathcal{N}$ ($\mathcal{N}$=16,36,64,100 and 144). The total density of states does not change much with lattice size, but the extended part of the density of states shows distinctive behaviors at different energy regions separated by critical energies $\pm E_c$. The ratio $\rho_{ext}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{N})/\rho(\varepsilon, \mathcal{N})$ is presented in Fig. 1 around $-E_c$ (with random magnetic field and impurity strengths chosen as $h_0 = 0.6\pi$ and $w = 1.0$, respectively). All the curves in

Fig. 1 cross at a fixed-point $\varepsilon = -E_c$, which is independent of the lattice size. At energy $\varepsilon < -E_c$, the extend-state density is continuously suppressed, and can be extrapolated down to zero as lattice size becomes infinity (see below). On the other hand, in the regime $-E_c < \varepsilon < E_c$, ρ_{ext}/ρ monotonically increases with lattice size and eventually saturates. Therefore, Fig. 1 clearly shows a metal-insulator transition at critical energies $\pm E_c$ (the curves in Fig. 1 are symmetric about $\varepsilon = 0$).

Let us consider in detail the localization at the band tail $\varepsilon < -E_c$. One may define two quantities characterizing the localization effect: a ratio R_0 of the number of extended states divided by the total number of states at energy $\varepsilon < -E_c$ region, and a mean width ΔE of the extended states in such a regime, both of which presumably will approach to zero in the thermodynamic limit. Here $R_0 = \int_{-\infty}^{-E_c} \rho_{ext}(\varepsilon)d\varepsilon / \int_{-\infty}^{-E_c} \rho(\varepsilon)d\varepsilon$ and $(\Delta E)^2 = \int_{-\infty}^{-E_c} [\varepsilon - (-E_c)]^2 \rho_{ext}(\varepsilon)d\varepsilon / \int_{-\infty}^{-E_c} \rho_{ext}(\varepsilon)d\varepsilon$. R_0 and ΔE versus the sample size are shown in Fig. 2 in a log-log plot at $h_0 = 0.6$ and $w = 1.0$. The data follow two parallel straight lines nicely, suggesting the following power-law behavior: $R_0 \sim \mathcal{N}^{-x}$ and $\Delta E \sim \mathcal{N}^{-x}$, with $x = 0.2 \pm 0.02$. Such a scaling law ensures the absence of the extended states outside the energy range $(-E_c,\ E_c)$ in the thermodynamic limit. In the localized region, localization length is a characteristic length scale (scaling parameter[19]), and for a finite-size sample with a width L the states with a localization length $\xi > L$ should appear as extended ones. If the localization length goes as $1/|\varepsilon - (-E_c)|^\nu$ when $\varepsilon \to -E_c$, one expects $1/(\Delta E)^\nu \sim L$, or $\Delta E \sim \mathcal{N}^{-1/2\nu}$ (Ref. 18). One also has $R_0 \propto \Delta E \rho(-E_c, \mathcal{N}) \propto \Delta E$. So the finite-size scalings of R_0 and ΔE in Fig. 2 imply a power-law behavior of the localization length ξ: $\xi \propto 1/|\varepsilon - (-E_c)|^\nu$ with $\nu = 1/2x = 2.5 \pm 0.3$.

At $-E_c < \varepsilon < E_c$, a monotonic increase of ρ_{ext}/ρ with sample size is manifestly metallic behavior. It is consistent with the behavior of $d(\xi_L/L)/dL > 0$ (ξ_L is the so-called decay length and ξ_L/L describes the extensiveness of the system) found in the metallic region of 3D system and 2D system with spin-orbit interaction (symplectic class).[19,20] In the present approach, the quantity ρ_{ext} directly characterizes extended states and can be extrapolated to a finite value at large sample size limit. One may also define a ratio

$N_{ext}/N_0 = \int_{-E_c}^{E_c} \rho_{ext} d\varepsilon / \int_{-E_c}^{E_c} \rho d\varepsilon$, namely the total number of extended states divided by the total number of states within $(-E_c,\ E_c)$. N_{ext}/N_0 is found to saturate to a finite value $R_c \sim 0.68$ in the following manner: $N_{ext}/N_0 - R_c \propto -N^{-y}$ ($y \sim 0.3$), which is shown in Fig. 3 by a log-log plot ($h_0 = 0.6$, $w = 1.0$). A finite R_c in the thermodynamic limit is a direct evidence for delocalization.

Very similar behaviors have also been obtained at other random-flux strengths: $h_0 = 0.4$ and 0.5 (with $w = 1.0$). Correspondingly, $E_c = \pm 3.7$ and ± 3.5, while $\nu = 1.25 \pm 0.3$ and 1.75 ± 0.3, respectively. The results suggest a non-universal localization exponent ν, which increases with h_0 and is consistent with a larger ν (~ 4.5) obtained at $h_0 > 0.7$ in Ref. 14. The reduction of the metallic region $(-E_c, E_c)$ indicates that the extended states are less favorable at larger h_0. With the increase of h_0 we find that ρ_{ext} becomes less sensitive to the sample size. When $h_0 > 0.7$, $\partial\rho_{ext}/\partial N$ is relatively small around the center of the energy band and a larger lattice size is needed in order to get conclusive results about delocalization. Since we study the density of states for the extended states characterized by the topological properties of wavefunctions (Hall conductances), finite-size effect is expected to be less important here in comparison with other approaches. The existence of the fixed-points $\pm E_c$, which are independent of lattice size, as well as the finite-size scalings on two sides of $\pm E_c$ indeed support this expectation.

In conclusion, we have unambiguously demonstrated the existence of a delocalization region for a non-interacting 2D electron system under a random magnetic field. Critical energy E_c of metal-insulator transition has been determined. Two branches of finite-size scaling are found in both metallic and localized regions, and the results are extrapolated to the thermodynamic limit. The localization length at the band tail ($\varepsilon < -E_c$, $\varepsilon > E_c$) behaves like $\xi \sim 1/|\varepsilon \pm E_c|^{\nu}$, with both E_c and ν varying with the strength of random magnetic field.

Acknowledgments -The present work is supported by the Texas Center for Superconductivity at the University of Houston and grants from Robert A. Welch Foundation and

Texas Advanced Research Program.

[1] E. Abrahams, P. W. Anderson, D. C. Liciardello, and V. Ramakrishnan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **42**, 673 (1979).

[2] For a review, see, P. A. Lee and T. V. Ramakrishnan, Rev. Mod. Phys. **57**, 287 (1985).

[3] R. B. Laughlin, Phys Rev. B. **23**, 5632 (1981); B. I. Halperrin, Phys. Rev. B. **25**, 2185 (1982).

[4] H. Levine, S. B. Libby and A. M. M. Pruisken, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51**, 1915 (1983); A. M. M. Pruisken, in **The Quantum Hall Effect**, edited by R. E. Prange and S. M. Girvin (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990).

[5]V. Kalmeyer and S. C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. B. **46**, 9889 (1992).

[6]B. I. Halperin, P. A. Lee and N. Read, Phys Rev. B. **47**, 7312 (1993).

[7] L. B. Ioffe and A. I. Larkin, Phys. Rev. B **39**, 8988 (1989); N. Nagaosa and P. A. Lee, Phys Rev. Lett. **64**, 2450 (1990); Phys. Rev. B. **45**, 966 (1992).

[8] Z. Y. Weng, D. N. Sheng and C. S. Ting, TCSUH preprint no. 95:011 (1995).

[9] S. C. Zhang and D. Arovas, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 1886, (1992).

[10] A. G. Aronov, A. D. Mirlin and P. Wolfle, preprint (1994).

[11] T. Sugiyama and N. Nagaosa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1980 (1993).

[12] Y. Avishai and Y. Hatsugai and M. Kohmoto, Phys. Rev. B. **47**, 9561 (1993).

[13] V. Kalmeyer, D. Wei, D. P. Arovas, and S. C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. B. **48**, 11095 (1993).

[14] D. Z. Liu, X. C. Xie, S. Das Sarma and S. C. Zhang, preprint (1994).

[15] D. J. Thouless, M. Kohmoto, M. P. Nightingale, and M. den Nijs, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 405 (1982); Q. Niu, D. J. Thouless, and Y. S. Wu, Phys. Rev. B **31**, 3372 (1985), D. J. Thouless, J. Phys. C, **17**, L325 (1984).

[16] M. Kohmoto, Ann. Phys. (NY) **160**, 343 (1985).

[17] D. P. Arovas et. al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 619 (1988).

[18] Y. Huo and R. N. Bhatt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 1375 (1992).

[19] A. MacKinnon and B. Kramer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **47**, 1546 (1981); Z. Phys. B **53**, 1 (1983).

[20] T. Ando, Phys. Rev. B **40**, 5325 (1989).

FIGURE CAPTION

Fig. 1. The ratio of the density of extended states over the total density of states is plotted as a function of energy (around $-E_c = -3.3$) for different sample size $\mathcal{N}$.

Fig. 2. R_0, the number of extended states divided by the total number of states at ($\varepsilon < -E_c$), and ΔE, the mean width of the band of extended states in the same energy region, vs. sample size $\mathcal{N}$ on a log-log scale. E_0 is a mean width of the band of total states at ($\varepsilon < -E_c$). All the data are fit into two parallel straight lines.

Fig. 3. N_{ext}/N_0, the number of extended states over the total number of states within energy region (-E_c, E_c), vs. sample size $\mathcal{N}$. The ratio is extrapolated to a finite number $R_c = 0.68$ in the thermodynamic limit, and solid line is a best fit to the data.